REMARKS

The Examiner's communication dated January 15, 2009 has been received and carefully considered. In conformance with the applicable statutory requirements, this paper constitutes a complete reply and/or a bona fide attempt to advance the application to allowance. Claims 1-2, 5-6 and 8-9 has been amended. In addition, detailed arguments in support of patentability are presented. Reexamination and/or reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested.

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Keiji (JP 09 039024 A)

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keiji in view of Arai (U.S. Patent No. 4,840,553).

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 6 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis issue. In particular, "runner portion" has been changed to --runner section-- in the second line of claim 6,

Claims Distinguish Patentably Over the Reference(s) of Record

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that an injection molding injector is fluidly connected to each of the plurality of mold cavities for injection molding molded articles therein and an in-mold coating injector has a single nozzle fluidly connected to each of the plurality of mold cavities for in-mold coating the molded articles in the plurality of mold cavities. As the Examiner concedes, Keiji does not teach that its injector 10 is for injection molding molded articles and thus injector 10 is not an injection molding injector. Similarly, the Examiner concedes that injector 9 of Keiji is not for in-mold coating molded articles and thus it is not an in-mold coating injector. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the anticipation rejection of claim 1 over Keiji should be withdrawn.

Recognizing Keiji's failure to teach a second composition injector, such as an inmold coating injector, having a single nozzle fluidly connected to each of a plurality of
mold cavities for in-mold coating the molded articles in the plurality of mold cavities, the
Examiner adds the teachings of Arai to Keiji and rejects the pending claims as allegedly
being obvious over this combination. In particular, the Examiner indicates that Arai
teaches a molding apparatus for molding multi-layer resin having first and second
composition injectors 12A and 12B which share a common pathway to fluidly connect to
the mold cavity 18A, referencing FIG. 7 of Arai. Per the Examiner, one of ordinary skill
would have found it obvious to provide the shared pathway of the first and second
composition injectors as taught by Arai in the molding apparatus of Keiji since this would
allow a second composition injector having a single nozzle to fluidly connect to a single
or a plurality of mold cavities, thus eliminating the need for a second composition
injector having a plurality of nozzles that individually connect to each of the plurality of
mold cavities.

There are several problems with the Examiner's combination of Keiji and Arai, particularly as applied against claim 1. First, the modification is quite complex and extensive. There is no way the sprues and runners of Arai could be easily applied to the arrangement of Keiji without inventiveness and undue experimentation. Arai is related to an entire different type of molding operation, particularly to sandwich molding in which a core layer of resin material is used for a central layer of a molded article and a skin layer resin material is used for the surface layer of the molded article.

More egregious, however, is that the combination of Keiji and Arai fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. In particular, the combination fails to disclose an in-mold coating injector having a single nozzle fluidly connecting to each of a plurality of mold cavities for in-mold coating the molded articles in the plurality of mold cavities. As the Examiner concedes, Keiji teaches an injector 10 having two nozzles each respectfully fluidly connected to a single mold cavity instead of having a single nozzle fluidly connected to each of a plurality of mold cavities. As the Examiner also apparently appreciates, Arai teaches the use of a common pathway to a single mold cavity 18A. Attempting to gloss over this omission, the Examiner argues that it would be obvious to provide the shared pathway of Arai in the molding apparatus of Keiji since

this would allow a second composition injector having a single nozzle to fluidly connect to a single or a plurality of mold cavities. This is hindsight interjection by the Examiner specifically provided for purposes of rejecting claim 1. There is no support in the combination of Keiji and Arai for the limitation of an in-mold coating injector having a single nozzle fluidly connected to each of a plurality of mold cavities.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and claims 2-9 dependent therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Dependent claim 5 calls for a second injector passageway to fluidly connect to the in-mold coating injector and the cited runner section of claim 2. The second injector passageway is recited as having a smaller cross-sectional area than the runner section adjacent an intersection between the second injector passageway and the runner section. The Examiner asserts that Arai teaches a second injector passageway 16a₁ fluidly connected to a second composition injector 12A and a runner section 16a₂. The Examiner then asserts that the gate 16b is the recited smaller cross-sectional area. However, dependent claim 6 calls for the runner section to be generally cylindrical with a portion of the runner section adjacent the intersection being relatively flat. For the second injector passageway and the runner section to have an intersection, these elements must touch one another. Thus, reservoir 16d must form a part of the alleged runner section 16a₂. Reservoir 16d is generally cylindrical (see FIG. 8A), but does not include a portion adjacent the intersection being relatively flat. That a portion of runner 16a₂ is flat is irrelevant as this is not adjacent an intersection between a runner portion and a second injector passageway.

Dependent claim 8, as amended, calls for the runner section to include a containment flange recess in which a molded containment flange is formed by injection molding from the injection molding injector that directs in-mold coating injected from the in-mold coating injector toward the plurality of mold cavities. It is respectfully submitted that the reservoir 16d of Arai is not a containment flange recess in which a molded containment flange is formed by injection molding.

CONCLUSION

All formal and informal matters having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that the claim changes clearly place the application in condition for allowance, defining over any fair teaching attributable to the references of record. Alternatively, if the Examiner is of the view that the application is not in clear condition for allowance, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned for purposes of conducting a telephone interview to resolve any outstanding differences. Accordingly, an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP

April 15, 2009 Date Erik J. Overberger, Reg. No. 48,556 1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor Cleveland, OH 44114-2579

216-861-5582

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any item referred to herein as being attached or enclosed) is (are)	
being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.	
transmitted to the USPTO by electronic transmission via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.	
Express Mail Label No.:	Signature: Jan M. Olafine
Date: April 15, 2009	Name: Audrey M. Dragony

N:\OMNZ\200039\US\AMD0009895V001.docx